



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/660,517	09/12/2003	Shu-Mei Chang	PO92279	5340
46103	7590	06/22/2006	EXAMINER CHEN, ALAN S	
HDSL 4331 STEVENS BATTLE LANE FAIRFAX, VA 22033			ART UNIT 2182	PAPER NUMBER

DATE MAILED: 06/22/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Advisory Action  
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief**

Application No. 10/660,517	Applicant(s) CHANG, SHU-MEI	
Examiner Alan S. Chen	Art Unit 2182	

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 18 June 2006 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☒ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) ☐ The period for reply expires \_\_\_\_\_ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.  
b) ☒ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**NOTICE OF APPEAL**

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

**AMENDMENTS**

3. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because  
(a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);  
(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);  
(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or  
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: \_\_\_\_\_. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).  
5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): \_\_\_\_\_.  
6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).  
7. ☐ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☐ will not be entered, or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.  
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:  
Claim(s) allowed: \_\_\_\_\_.  
Claim(s) objected to: \_\_\_\_\_.  
Claim(s) rejected: \_\_\_\_\_.  
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: \_\_\_\_\_.

**AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE**

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).  
9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).  
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

**REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER**

11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:  
See Continuation Sheet.  
12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_.  
13. ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

**KIM HUYNH**  
**SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER**

5/21/06

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Examiner believes the prior art references to Lazzarotto et al. (Lazzarotto) and Yen et al. (Yen) establish a prima facie case of obviousness. Applicant's arguments do not remove the motivation to combine the aforementioned references given in the final office action. Applicant main argument is the primary and secondary modules used are unpluggable and have plug-and-play capability while Lazzarotto and Yen do not teach or suggest this. Examiner does not agree.

As pointed out in the final office action, Lazzarotto clearly shows two receiving modules connected to each other via a USB hub (Fig. 6B, elements 604 and 605 connected to each other via USB HUB). While Lazzarotto does not expressly disclose elements 604 and 605 being unpluggable, Yen shows wireless transceiver modules directly analogous to Lazzarotto being unpluggable and attached to USB hubs. The motivation to use this unpluggable design of Yen in Lazzarotto was clearly given in the final office action, e.g., being able to adopt a various different wireless protocols. Column 8, lines 60+ of Lazzarotto disclose the desire to communicationg at various frequencies, certain frequencies requiring different antennas. Clearly there also exists various disparate communication protocols, i.e., bluetooth, WiFi, IR, that all require a different antenna. Therefore, the motivation to have unpluggable transceivers is clear.

Per arguments regarding the reasonability for success in combining, it is well-known to one of ordinary skill in the art that USB hub (which both Yen and Lazzarotto utilize) can accomodates various hot pluggable devices. The USB specification clearly spells out the implementation of USB hubs. The Examiner believes one of ordinary skill in the art would have the know-how to implement the USB hub in order to have the two transceivers shown in Fig. 6B in a hot-pluggable fashion. Afterall, Yen clearly shows that at least one wireless transceiver is hotpluggable to the hub, next to various addition USB hotpluggalbe devices (Fig. 1)